

Amendments to the Specifications:

Please replace page 11, line 7 through 9 (Table) with the following amended Table:

<u>TIME</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>ZIP TO</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>ZIP TO</u>	<u>RATIO, %,</u> <u>CITY TO</u>
	<u>TO ZIP</u>	<u>TO CITY</u>	<u>TO COUNTY</u>	<u>CITY</u>	<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>COUNTY</u>
1994	103	120	<u>127-112</u>	117	109	94
1995				120	109	91
1996						90
1997						91
1998						85
1999	110	189	<u>127-153</u>	172	139	81
2000	106	185	<u>139-144</u>	175	136	78
2001	108	197	<u>141-146</u>	182	135	74
2002	96	169	<u>125-139</u>	176	145	82
2003	96	164	<u>127-133</u>	170	138	81
2003*	98	166	<u>127-133</u>	170	138	81
2003**	134	228	<u>152-185</u>	170	138	81

* proposed realistic value

** proposed unrealistic value

Please replace page 11, lines 15 through 18 with the following amended paragraph:

It also is evident that the ratios computed from the unrealistic valuation (134%, 228%, 152% 185%) stand out somewhat from the rest of the matrix. The unrealistic valuation is apparent when measured arithmetically by subtraction. For example, by way of subtraction, 134% is 24% higher than 110%, the

Please replace page 12, lines 1 through 3 with the following amended paragraph:

maximum ratio found in the column above it. Similarly, 228% is 31 % higher than 197%, the maximum ratio in the column above it, and 185% is 32% higher than 153%, 152% is 11% higher than 141%, the maximum ratio in the column above it.

Please replace page 12, lines 8 and 9 (Table) with the following amended Table:

Realistic	Unrealistic
$98\% / 110\% = 89\%$	$134\% / 110\% = 122\%$
$166\% / 197\% = 84\%$	$228\% / 197\% = 116\%$
$127\% / 141\% = 90\%$ $133\% / 153\% = 87\%$	$152\% / 144\% = 106\%$ $185\% / 153\% = 121\%$

Attachments: "Clean Specifications Sheet"